

### REMARKS

The undersigned attorney thanks the Examiner for her courtesy extended during the telephone interview on December 21, 2004. The  
5 undersigned attorney understands that the Examiner will prepare an Interview Summary covering the interview.

In view of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This Amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the final Office Action  
10 mailed December 2, 2004.

### Claim Rejections

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being  
15 anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,790,782 to Martinez, et al. (hereinafter, "the '782 patent") as modified by the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 5,965,665 to Martinez, et al. ("the '665 patent"). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 10 recites the limitation of "a cabinet bus linked to each of the shelves and adapted to *generate* and provide a unique shelf  
20 identifier signal to each of the shelves." The '782 patent, alone or in combination with the '665 patent, fails to disclose (or even to suggest) a cabinet bus that *generates* and provides a unique shelf identifier signal to each of the shelves. To the contrary, the connectors in the '782 do not *generate* a signal; they merely transfer a simple analog voltage. Further, the  
25 analog voltage disclosed in the '782 patent it is not a shelf identifier signal.

The analog voltage signal must be processed by an A/D converter and the EMU to generate a meaningful shelf identifier signal. (See col. 5, line 28 through col. 6, line 18). Therefore, the '782 patent cannot anticipate (or render obvious) claim 10.

- 5           Dependent claims 11-18 depend ultimately from claim 10, and are allowable in view of this dependency, and in view of the specific limitations recited therein.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

- 10           Independent claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the '782 patent in view of the '665 patent. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the respective first and second junction boxes *generate* and provide a signal that identifies the shelf. As noted above, Martinez neither discloses nor suggests an arrangement in which the
- 15 junction boxes that form the cabinet bus generate and provide a shelf identifier signal. Accordingly, the '782 patent, alone or in combination with the '665 patent, cannot render obvious independent claim 1.

- Independent claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the '782 patent in view of the '665 patent". Applicants
- 20 traverse this rejection. Independent claim 19 recites the limitation that the cabinet bus is adapted to *generate* and to provide a unique shelf identifier to each of the shelves. The '782 patent, alone or in combination with the '665 patent, fails to disclose or suggest a cabinet bus that *generates* and provides a unique shelf identifier signal to each of the shelves. As noted above, the
- 25 connectors in the '782 patent carry a simple analog voltage signal between

shelves. The connectors do not generate a signal. Further, the signal disclosed in the '782 patent it is not a shelf identifier signal. The analog voltage signal must be processed by an A/D converter and the EMU to generate a meaningful shelf identifier signal. (See col. 5, line 28 through col. 5 6, line 18). Therefore, the '782 patent, alone or in combination with the '665 patent, cannot render obvious claim 19.

Claims 20-21 depend ultimately from claim 19, and are allowable at least by virtue of this dependency. In addition, claims 20-21 recite specific structural limitations neither disclosed nor suggested by the '782 patent, 10 alone or in combination with the '665 patent.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1-21 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

10

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jed W. Caven  
Attorney for Applicants



Dated: December 22, 2004

15

Jed W. Caven  
Caven & Aghevi, LLP  
Reg. No. 40,551  
(720) 841.9544

20

Direct correspondence to:  
Hewlett-Packard Company  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

25